



**GCE**

**Psychology**

**H567/03: Applied psychology**

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for November 2020**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.
















This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2020

**Annotations**

Annotation	Meaning
	Tick
	Incorrect response
	Benefit of doubt given
	Attempts evaluation
	Context
	Evaluation
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	Not answered question
	Unclear
	Good use of research/supporting evidence
	Development of point
	Omission mark
	Use in conjunction with other annotations to highlight text
	Use in conjunction with other annotations to highlight text
	Blank page

### Subject-specific Marking Instructions

#### INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

You should ensure also that you are familiar with the administrative procedures related to the marking process. These are set out in the OCR booklet **Instructions for Examiners**. If you are examining for the first time, please read carefully **Appendix 5 Introduction to Script Marking: Notes for New Examiners**.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

#### LEVELS OF RESPONSE – LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Good	Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and detailed description.	Response demonstrates good application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application will be mainly explicit, accurate and relevant.	Response demonstrates good analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding.
Reasonable	Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate description lacking some detail.	Response demonstrates reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application will be partially explicit, accurate and relevant.	Response demonstrates reasonable analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument are competent and understanding is reasonable.
Limited	Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and	Response demonstrates limited application of psychological knowledge	Response demonstrates limited analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that may be

H567/03

Mark Scheme

November 2020

	understanding. Limited description lacking in detail.	and understanding. Application may be related to the general topic area rather than the specific question.	related to topic area. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments.
Basic	Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is only partially relevant. Basic description with no detail.	Response demonstrates basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Responses will be generalised lacking focus on the question.	Response demonstrates basic analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is not related to the question. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise issues. No evidence of arguments.

## USING THE MARK SCHEME

Please study this Mark Scheme carefully. The Mark Scheme is an integral part of the process that begins with the setting of the question paper and ends with the awarding of grades. Question papers and Mark Schemes are developed in association with each other so that issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed from the very start.

This Mark Scheme is a working document; it is not exhaustive; it does not provide 'correct' answers. The Mark Scheme can only provide 'best guesses' about how the question will work out, and it is subject to revision after we have looked at a wide range of scripts.

In your marking, you will encounter valid responses which are not covered by the Mark Scheme: these responses must be credited. You will encounter answers which fall outside the 'target range' of Bands for the paper which you are marking. Please mark these answers according to the marking criteria.

Please read carefully all the scripts in your allocation and make every effort to look positively for achievement throughout the ability range. Always be prepared to use the full range of marks.

## INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS: INDIVIDUAL ANSWERS

1 The indicative content indicates the expected parameters for candidates' answers, but be prepared to recognise and credit unexpected approaches where they show relevance.

**2** Using 'best-fit', decide first which set of BAND DESCRIPTORS best describes the overall quality of the answer. Once the band is located, adjust the mark concentrating on features of the answer which make it stronger or weaker following the guidelines for refinement.

**Highest mark:** If clear evidence of all the qualities in the band descriptors is shown, the HIGHEST Mark should be awarded.

**Lowest mark:** If the answer shows the candidate to be borderline (i.e. they have achieved all the qualities of the bands below and show limited evidence of meeting the criteria of the band in question) the LOWEST mark should be awarded.

**Middle mark:** This mark should be used for candidates who are secure in the band. They are not 'borderline' but they have only achieved some of the qualities in the band descriptors.

**3** Be prepared to use the full range of marks. Do not reserve (e.g.) high Band 6 marks 'in case' something turns up of a quality you have not yet seen. If an answer gives clear evidence of the qualities described in the band descriptors, reward appropriately.

**4** Consideration should be given to the weightings of the assessment objectives within a question, these are clearly stated for each question and care should be taken not to place too much emphasis on a particular skill.

## Section A: Issues in mental health

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p><b>Outline one way of defining abnormality in relation to mental health.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates may give definitions such as ‘deviation from social norms’, ‘failure to function adequately’ or ‘behaviour that does not fit with the context’. A definition could also include reference to diagnostic criteria in manuals such as the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) or Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM), arguing that abnormality can be defined by meeting such criteria.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	2	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate definition.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial definition.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p> <p>To access full marks, the candidate must include one definition that has been cited in psychological literature. Marks will only be allocated to one way of defining abnormality.</p>
	(b)	<p><b>Explain one weakness of this way of defining abnormality.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (1 mark)</b> Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding by commenting accurately on the way of defining abnormality referred to in response to the previous question.</p> <p><b>AO3 (2 marks)</b> There are many weaknesses that could be referred to (depending on the way of defining abnormality outlined in part (a)). For instance, statistical rarity may not make something an abnormality; definitions in terms of deviation from social norms are vulnerable to criticisms of cultural or temporal relativity; references to a failure to function adequately may reflect normative judgements about how people ought to lead their lives; definitions in terms of not meeting the criteria for ideal mental health are likely to set</p>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Response demonstrates good analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. There is good relevant knowledge and understanding.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates reasonable analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. There is reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding.</p> <p><b>1 marks</b> – Response demonstrates limited analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that may be related to the topic area. There is limited relevant knowledge and understanding.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>

H567/03

Mark Scheme

November 2020

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>the standard so high that almost everyone can be described as abnormal at some point in their lives; references to ICD or DSM presuppose the validity and/or reliability of their diagnostic criteria.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>		
2	(a)	<p><b>Outline one way this finding illustrates reliability.</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (3 marks)</b> Candidates should apply their knowledge and understanding of reliability to the context of the question. Candidates could comment on the fact that the suspicions involved two members of staff in agreement with each other (i.e. inter-rater reliability); they could also refer to the fact that judgements were made in respect of 193 patients (i.e. a large enough sample to be able to establish a trend).</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Good – accurate outline of one way the finding illustrates reliability.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Reasonable – generally accurate outline of one way the finding illustrates reliability.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Limited outline of one way the finding illustrates reliability.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>
2	(b)	<p><b>Outline one way this finding illustrates ethnocentrism.</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (3 marks)</b> Candidates should apply their knowledge and understanding of ethnocentrism to the context of the question. Candidates are likely to draw attention to the fact that the study was carried out in the USA. They should then go further than this to explain that therefore the study only tells us about diagnosis of mental illness in the USA and nowhere else.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Good – accurate outline of one way the finding illustrates ethnocentrism.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Reasonable – generally accurate outline of one way the finding illustrates ethnocentrism.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Limited outline of one way the finding illustrates ethnocentrism.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>



H567/03

Mark Scheme

November 2020

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	(a)	<p><b>In the key research by Szasz (2011), mental illness is described as a “myth”. What does Szasz mean by this?</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (3 marks)</b> Szasz sees mental illness as a “linguistic-rhetorical phenomenon” describing behaviours that disturb or disorient others or the self. He argues that if a mental illness turns out to have a biological basis to it then it was never a mental illness but instead was an undiagnosed bodily illness. If it is not a bodily illness then describing it as a mental illness involves perpetuating a particular (medicalised) way of viewing behaviours that leads to the ‘patient’ being the subject of coercive ‘treatment’ rather than being seen as an active player in a real-life drama. In short, Szasz’s views is that there is no such thing as mental illness: it is just our modern “pseudomedical” perspective on the tragic nature of life.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Good knowledge and understanding of Szasz’s description of mental illness as a myth.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Reasonable knowledge and understanding of Szasz’s description of mental illness as a myth.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Limited knowledge and understanding of Szasz’s description of mental illness as a myth.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>
3	(b)	<p><b>To what extent do you agree with Szasz’s claim that mental illness is a “myth”?</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (1 mark)</b> Arguments should be illustrated with appropriate examples (e.g. of medicalisation, politicisation, treatment, etc.)</p> <p><b>AO3 (4 marks)</b> Candidates could present arguments on either side (or both sides) of this debate. They could agree with Szasz’s argument, perhaps referring to social control of people diagnosed with mental illness or making points about the pharmaceutical industry’s financial interest in seeing ever more mental disorders ‘discovered’. Alternatively, they could disagree with Szasz’s argument, possibly referring to</p>	5	<p><b>5 marks</b> – Good discussion of the extent to which the candidate agrees with Szasz’s description of mental illness as a “myth”.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – Reasonable discussion of the extent to which the candidate agrees with Szasz’s description of mental illness as a “myth”.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Limited discussion of the extent to which the candidate agrees with Szasz’s description of mental illness as a “myth”.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>how people are often comforted by having their experience given a diagnostic 'label', or making the point that Szasz's argument risks shutting off a range of ways of helping people that they often find really useful. To be able to access the top band, candidates must express a judgement about the extent to which they agree with Szasz's description of mental illness as a "myth".</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>		
4	(a)	<p><b>Identify one specific disorder and identify an appropriate non-biological treatment for it.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of an appropriate non-biological treatment for one specific disorder.</p>	2	<p><b>1 mark</b> – identification of one specific disorder <b>1 mark</b> – identification of an appropriate non-biological treatment for the specified disorder</p> <p>NB For both marks, the treatment has to be non-biological and has to be an appropriate treatment for the identified disorder.</p>
4	(b)	<p><b>Explain how this treatment can contribute to the success of the economy and society.</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (4 marks)</b> Candidates should explain the benefits to the economy and society of the non-biological treatment identified in their answer to part (a). Points made could centre on how the treatment might enable the patient to return to work (or continue working), thereby benefitting the economy as they are working and presumably paying taxes rather than potentially being off ill and maybe requiring their employer to hire temporary staff to do their work and/or possibly claiming sickness benefits. Benefits to society could centre on (for example) the patient being able to continue in caring roles and/or doing voluntary work as well as interacting successfully with friends, family, colleagues, etc.</p>	4	<p><b>3-4 marks</b> – good attempt at explaining how the treatment can contribute to the success of the economy and society. At least two lines of argument are explored with relevant supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – limited attempt at explaining how the treatment can contribute to the success of the economy and society. One line of argument is explored with reasonable supporting evidence or two lines of argument are explored with limited supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – no creditworthy response</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
				Other appropriate responses should be credited.
5	*	<p><b>Discuss mental illness in relation to the individual/ situational explanations debate.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the individual/ situational explanations debate.</p> <p><b>AO3 (8 marks)</b> Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate explanations of mental illness in relation to the individual/ situational explanations debate. For instance, situational explanations might involve reference being made to behaviourist learning theories – e.g. in terms of a mental illness being the result of external factors affecting the individual through classical conditioning, operant conditioning and/or social learning. Individual explanations are likely to refer to biological explanations (in terms of biochemical factors, genetic inheritance and/or brain abnormality). Other explanations could also be cited and candidates may argue that both individual and situational factors are likely to play a part in explaining mental illness. Treatments can be made relevant as evidence on either side of the debate.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	10	<p><b>9-10 marks</b> – The response demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of the individual/ situational explanations debate. There is a good interpretation and evaluation of the individual/ situational explanations debate in relation to explanations of mental illness. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p><b>6-8 marks</b> – The response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding of the individual/ situational explanations debate. There is a reasonable discussion of the individual/ situational explanations debate in relation to explanations of mental illness. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p> <p><b>3-5 marks</b> – The response demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the individual/ situational explanations debate. There is a limited discussion of the individual/ situational explanations debate superficially related to explanations of mental illness. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – The response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the individual/ situational explanations debate. There is a basic discussion of the individual/ situational explanations debate which may not be in relation to explanations of mental illness. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	

## Section B: Options

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	(a)	*	<p><b>Outline the key research by Gibson and Walk (1960) and explain what it tells us about the development of perception.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (5 marks)</b> Candidates must refer to the key study by Gibson and Walk. Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively.</p> <p><b>AO2 (5 marks)</b> Candidates should <i>apply</i> their knowledge and understanding of the study by Gibson and Walk to explain what it tells us about the development of <i>depth</i> perception. Answers can be expected to note that the ability to perceive depth seems to be innate. Better answers will go further and refer to investigation of depth cues used by young animals in an attempt to identify which depth cues are present from birth (i.e. to explain the development of depth perception, rather than just describe it). Whilst relative size was used (when patterns with squares of different sizes were placed directly against the underside of the glass on both sides of the 'visual cliff' apparatus), the experience of day-old chicks and dark-reared rats suggested that this was learned, rather than innate. Further investigation suggested motion parallax to be the innate depth cue used by these animals. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without using it to explain what it tells us about the development of perception will only gain marks in the lower bands.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1

	(b)	<p><b>Discuss methodological issues involved when researching perceptual development.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of methodological issues.</p> <p><b>AO3 (13 marks)</b> Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate methodological issues of research into perceptual development. As well as referring to the key research, candidates can refer to research investigating perceptual development in children and how this can be studied in babies and animals. Any relevant study is creditworthy. Candidates could explore a range of issues including obtaining a representative sample of participants, issues arising from limitations in ways of collecting data from young infants, the need for carers to often remain present, researcher effects, researcher bias, reliability of findings, validity of conclusions drawn, etc. Answers can be critical but can also defend the research. Methodological issues need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	15	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2
--	-----	--	----	----------------------------

	(c)	<p><b>Outline at least one play strategy Mary could use to develop perception in the children attending her nursery school.</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (10 marks)</b> Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of at least one play strategy to develop perception in young children. Suggestions could centre on adapting elements from within sensory integration therapy such as cooking, messy play, listening activities, etc., in accordance with the particular sensory skills being nurtured (e.g. visual-perceptual, fine motor, posture, auditory, etc.). Suggestions could also centre on the development of visual form constancy (e.g. through use of shape sorters or structured block play) or auditory perceptual constancy (e.g. through listening to music). It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3
--	-----	---	----	----------------------------

7	(a)	<p><b>Using the key research by Raine et al (1997), explain what makes a criminal.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (5 marks)</b> Candidates must refer to the key study by Raine et al. Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively.</p> <p><b>AO2 (5 marks)</b> Candidates should <i>apply</i> their knowledge and understanding of the study to explain what makes a criminal. Answers can be expected to focus on Raine's findings of differences in brain metabolism among defendants pleading Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity for either murder or manslaughter relative to a control group. In particular, the NGRIs were found to have lower levels of metabolic activity in the prefrontal cortex and abnormal levels of activity in the amygdala. These findings could be used to explain what makes a criminal as the reduced levels of activity in the prefrontal cortex could contribute to a lack of self-control while the abnormal levels of activity in the amygdala could contribute to fearlessness. Taken together, such differences in levels of metabolic activity in the brain could help explain the sorts of crime the NGRIs were being accused of. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without using it to explain what makes a criminal will only gain marks in the lower bands.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1
---	-----	--	----	----------------------------

	(b)	<p><b>Discuss the validity of research into what makes a criminal.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of validity.</p> <p><b>AO3 (13 marks)</b> Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate the validity of research into what makes a criminal. As well as referring to the key research, candidates can refer to research investigating physiological and non-physiological explanations of criminal behaviour. Any relevant study is creditworthy. Candidates may make reference to ecological validity, population validity, construct validity, etc., or could refer to aspects of studies that affect validity such as extraneous variables, demand characteristics or social desirability bias. Candidates may be critical in the points they make but, equally, they may defend research. The validity of research needs to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	15	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2
--	-----	--	----	----------------------------



	(c)	<p><b>Outline at least one biological strategy a psychologist might suggest to Ray that could be used to prevent prisoners from committing crimes in the future.</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (10 marks)</b> Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of at least one biological strategy for preventing criminal behaviour. Suggestions could centre on dietary interventions such as fish-oil supplements, but could also centre on changes to the prison buildings such as removal of any lead pipes. Equally, answers could potentially explore cosmetic surgery or interventions involving reductions in testosterone levels or correction of genetic abnormalities. It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question and are suggestions that a psychologist might potentially make (so should therefore be within ethical guidelines).</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3
--	-----	--	----	----------------------------

8	(a)	<p><b>Outline the key research by Black and Black (2007) and explain what it tells us about environmental stressors.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (5 marks)</b> Candidates must refer to the key study by Black and Black. Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively.</p> <p><b>AO2 (5 marks)</b> Candidates should <i>apply</i> their knowledge and understanding of the study by Black and Black to explain what it tells us about environmental stressors. Answers can be expected to focus on noise as an environmental stressor. Reference could be made to the negative health effects of noise and how it is associated with reduced physical functioning, general health, vitality and mental health (as self-reported through the SF-36 instrument). Reference can also be made to how aircraft noise was found to be annoying by those exposed to it (mean score of 6.27 for those exposed to it, compared to 1.03 for the control group). Noise exposure on a long-term basis was associated with chronic noise stress which in turn was associated with hypertension. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without using it to explain the what it tells us about environmental stressors will only gain marks in the lower bands.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1
---	-----	---	----	----------------------------

	(b)	<p><b>Discuss the reductionism/holism debate in relation to research into stressors in the environment.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the reductionism/holism debate.</p> <p><b>AO3 (13 marks)</b> Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate research into stressors in the environment in relation to the reductionism/holism debate. As well as referring to the key research, candidates can refer to research investigating environmental stressors and their impact on our biological responses. Any relevant research is creditworthy. Candidates may note how research in this area typically identifies one aspect of the environment at a time to find out the extent to which (and the ways in which) that particular factor can be a cause of stress. Such factors can include noise, temperature and overcrowding. On the other side of the debate, it may be noted that studies can be holistic, such as by collecting data on a range of different variables (e.g. biological, cognitive, behavioural, etc.) or by investigating which of varying environmental stressors is having the strongest negative effect. Candidates may argue for reductionism/holism in relation to research into stressors in the environment. Points about the reductionism/holism debate need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	15	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2
--	-----	---	----	----------------------------

	(c)	<p><b>Outline at least one strategy for managing environmental stress that a psychologist might suggest to commuters like Simon.</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (10 marks)</b> Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of at least one strategy for managing environmental stress. There are a wide range of suggestions that could be made based on different environmental stressors that could affect commuters. For example, if travelling by car, reference could be made to commuters turning the radio off so that they are in a quiet environment and/or adjusting the temperature of their vehicle's cabin to ensure it isn't too hot. If travelling by train, commuters could be advised to arrive early to improve their chances of obtaining a seat (something which might help to address feelings of being overcrowded). Alternatively, taking greener routes can reduce environmental stress. Emotion-focused strategies such as various forms of cognitive behavioural therapy can also be referred to (e.g. stress inoculation therapy). It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3
--	-----	---	----	----------------------------

9	(a)	<p><b>Outline the key research by Smith et al (1979) and explain what it tells us about coaching in sport.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (5 marks)</b> Candidates must refer to the key study by Smith et al. Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively.</p> <p><b>AO2 (5 marks)</b> Candidates should <i>apply</i> their knowledge and understanding of the study by Smith et al to explain what it tells us about coaching in sport. Answers can be expected to focus on how a programme such as Coach Effectiveness Training (CET) can lead to players enjoying their sport more, having a better relationship with their team-mates, and experiencing increased levels of self-esteem. Answers ought to acknowledge, though, that such programmes may not necessarily lead to a significant improvement in the results achieved by the sports teams on the field of play. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without using it to explain what it tells us about coaching in sport will only gain marks in the lower bands.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1
---	-----	--	----	----------------------------

	(b)	<p><b>Discuss the nature/nurture debate in relation to research into performing with others in sport.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the nature-nurture debate.</p> <p><b>AO3 (13 marks)</b> Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate research into performing with others in sport in relation to the nature-nurture debate. As well as referring to the key research, candidates can refer to research investigating teams, coaching and leadership. Any relevant research is creditworthy. In terms of evidence in support of nurture, candidates can be expected to refer to research (e.g. Smith et al) suggesting the difference that coaching can make, particularly with children. Trait theories of leadership (e.g. Stodgill) would provide evidence from the nature side of the debate, while a model of leadership such as that presented by Chelladurai could be said to reflect both sides of the debate. Candidates may argue for nature or nurture in relation to research into performing with others in sport. Points about the nature-nurture debate need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	15	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2
--	-----	--	----	----------------------------

	(c)	<p><b>Outline at least one strategy a psychologist might suggest for how Sharmin could improve the performance of her cricket team.</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (10 marks)</b> Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of at least one strategy for improving team performance. Answers may centre on ways of fostering team cohesion (based on Carron et al, 2002) such as getting to know players personally, encouraging open and easy communication between team players, or developing group norms. In addition to improving social cohesion within teams, increases in task cohesion can also be proposed. Reference could also be made to congruence between predicted, preferred and actual leadership behaviours (Chelladurai, 1978). Goal setting (using SMART targets and with follow-up feedback) can also be relevant. It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3
--	-----	--	----	----------------------------

**APPENDIX 1****Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (a) QUESTIONS**

AO1: *Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)*

AO2: *Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)*

Level	Marks	Generic mark scheme (Part a)	Guidance
4	9 – 10	<p>Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and reasonably detailed description. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question.</p> <p>Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question.</p> <p>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p>	<p>Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. For example, the answer may contain detailed knowledge of the study (e.g. a number of accurate fine details) and/or detailed understanding of how to apply it (e.g. making a number of different, relevant application points, rather than just one application point). Alternatively, answers may 'go beyond' by bringing in additional supporting research (i.e. use more than just the key study to address the question) where the wording of the question permits this.</p>
3	6 – 8	<p>Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate description lacking some detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.</p> <p>Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question.</p> <p>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p>	<p>A standard response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e. be awarded 7 marks).</p> <p>The answer is essentially accurate. There is adequate description of the key study and it is applied in the way that the question requires. Broadly speaking, the candidate is correct in what they are saying. However, their answer lacks the extension (detailed knowledge of the study and/or detailed understanding of how to apply it) that typifies answers in the top band.</p>
2	3 – 5	<p>Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.</p> <p>Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question.</p>	<p>Answers can be limited for a number of reasons. For example, description of the study may lack the detail (or accuracy) that can be expected of a standard response; the key study may be described but not actually applied in the way that the question requires; the examiner may not be convinced of the candidate's understanding.</p>



H567/03

Mark Scheme

November 2020

		<p>Application may be related to the general topic area rather than the specific question.</p> <p>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</p>	
<b>1</b>	<b>1 – 2</b>	<p>Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding. Description is basic. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.</p> <p>Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question.</p> <p>The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p>	Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but essentially are wrong/flawed in what is being said.
<b>0</b>		No creditworthy response.	Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material.

**APPENDIX 2****Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (b) QUESTIONS**

*AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (2 marks)*

*AO3: Analyse, interpret and evaluate scientific information, ideas and evidence (13 marks)*

<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Generic mark scheme (part b)</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>12–15</b>	<p>Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Response demonstrates many points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question.</p>	Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. For example, the candidate may present intellectually surprising arguments, their arguments may centre on well-informed comparisons of evidence, or they may explore (quantitatively) more arguments than a

H567/03

Mark Scheme

November 2020

		Effective use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.	'standard' response will.
<b>3</b>	<b>8–11</b>	Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a reasonable number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Reasonable use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are competent and understanding is reasonable. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	A standard, accurate response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e. be awarded 9-10 marks). Answers in this band are evaluative rather than descriptive, and points made are backed up with relevant supporting evidence. If one evaluative point is explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 8 marks. If two evaluative points are explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 9-10 marks. If three evaluative points are explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 10-11 marks.
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a limited number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation which are limited in range. Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments. Demonstrates some understanding. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.	Answers can be limited for a number of reasons. For example, they may be essentially descriptive (rather than evaluative); the examiner may not be convinced that the answer is discussing the relevant concept (e.g. in a question about validity, the candidate's answer may seem to be more about reliability); the response may raise appropriate evaluative points but these may lack relevant supporting evidence.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a few basic points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting	Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but it is not used effectively (e.g. in a question about discussion of ethical considerations, ethical guidelines are named but they are not then related to the topic in the question).

H567/03

Mark Scheme

November 2020

	examples. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise issues and arguments show little understanding. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	
<b>0</b>	No creditworthy response.	Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material.

**APPENDIX 3****GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR SECTION B PART (c) QUESTIONS***AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (10 marks)*

<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Generic Mark Scheme (part c)</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>9 – 10</b>	Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question.  There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.	Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. This might be because the advice comprises a range of different suggestions (e.g. three or more explained in context and with appropriate psychological rationale for them). Alternatively, if taking a 'depth' approach, the answer would contain application and rationale beyond that seen in standard, accurate responses.
<b>3</b>	<b>6 – 8</b>	Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question.  There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	A standard, accurate response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e. be awarded 7 marks).  Advice put forward by the candidate will be related to the scenario in the question and there will be explicit and appropriate psychological rationale for the advice (e.g. named psychological research, concepts or theories). It is clear what is being suggested (i.e. it is specific) and why it is being suggested.  Candidates can take either a 'breadth' or 'depth' approach (e.g. the advice may comprise two or possibly

H567/03

Mark Scheme

November 2020

			even three suggestions, but it could equally well centre on one suggestion explained in detail).
<b>2</b>	<b>3 – 5</b>	<p>Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may relate to the general topic area rather than the specific question.</p> <p>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</p>	<p>Answers can be in this band for a number of reasons. For example, the advice offered may not be related to the scenario in the question (i.e. it may be generic) or it may lack appropriate psychological rationale. It is unclear what is being suggested (i.e. what the precise advice is) or why it is being suggested.</p>
<b>1</b>	<b>1 – 2</b>	<p>Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: Responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way.</p> <p>The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p>	<p>Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but it is not used effectively (e.g. advice is offered but it is generic and has no psychological rationale behind it).</p>
<b>0</b>		No creditworthy response.	Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored